

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Brc 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/715,122	11/18/2003	Tadayoshi Tominaga	03194	2753	
23338 75	90 04/06/2005		EXAMINER		
DENNISON, SCHULTZ, DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD			MAI, NGOCLAN THI		
1727 KING STI SUITE 105	REET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22314		1742		
			DATE MAILED: 04/06/200:	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					\sim			
		Appli	cation No.	Applicant(s)	V			
Office Action Summary		10/71	15,122	TOMINAGA ET AL.				
		Exam	iner	Art Unit				
			an T. Mai	1742				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communor Reply	nication appears on	the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address	ş			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN ensions of time may be available under the provisions or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com- e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 O period for reply is specified above, the maximum soure to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In n munication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply a y will, by statute, cause the	no event, however, may a reply to e statutory minimum of thirty (30 and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS e application to become ABAND	be timely filed) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communion (ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ication.			
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 11/18/03						
,	•	2b)⊠ This action	is non-final.					
3)	,—							
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	tion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the all 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	are withdrawn from						
Applicat	tion Papers							
	The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objections sheet(s) including sheet(s) including	e: a) accepted o	(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)□	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation	documents have lead of the priority documents have lead to be priority documental Bureau (PCT)	been received been received in Appli uments have been rec Rule 17.2(a))	cation No eived in this National Stage	e .			
Attachmen	it(s)							
1) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summ					
3) 🛛 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or er No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/18/03</u> .		Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	nal Patent Application (PTO-152)				



Application/Control Number: 10/715,122 Page 2

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaucher et al.
- 3. Gaucher et al discloses a method for treating parts made of Ti or Ti alloy by heat treating the parts in oxidative atmosphere at a predetermined temperature and time to obtain a non-pulverous surface layer with a thickness sufficient for enabling the parts to rub without seizing, col. 4, lines 20-30. Gaucher et al teaches that heating part at 600 C for more than 12-1/2 hours would result in pulverous layer, while keeping said part at 600 C for less than 3-1/2 hours would give a layer, which is too thin to allow rubbing correctly. Note that by desiring non-pulverous layer Gaucher et al. implies that parts that have low surface roughness but sufficient thickness so that the parts can be rubbed without seizing are preferred. Gaucher et al teaches for all parts treated, the total hardness δ , the thickness ϵ of the layers formed with the time unit and the friction coefficient f of the test piece were measured for each experiment, col. 6, lines 7-11. Gaucher et al therefore teaches the step of determining an effective thickness of hard oxide film to be form on the surface of titanium part. Gaucher et al teaches the treated

Ti parts to have oxide thickness greater than 10 microns and that friction coefficient can have a low value of 0.07, see col. 3, line 67 to col. 4, line 4 and lines 48-50.

The differences between the claims and Gaucher et al Gaucher et al does not specifically teach determining an effective surface roughness of the hard oxide film and engine valve treated by the claimed surface treating.

Since it is known in the coating art that surface roughness relates to friction coefficient and that lower surface roughness improves friction coefficient, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Gaucher et al so that a determination of the surface roughness of hard oxide layer be made to obtain oxide layer that is non-pulverous. It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that engine valve formed of Ti or Ti alloy be treated by the method taught by Gaucher et al. since engine valves must withstand the abrasion resulting from the friction with the valve seat. Determination of an optimum or preferred thickness and surface roughness of the hard oxide layer to be formed on engine valve made of Ti alloy to provide optimum abrasion resistance employing the method taught by Gaucher et al is within the level of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoclan T. Mai whose telephone number is (571) 272-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 PM Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 1742

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

((od) MQ, Ngoclan T. Mai Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742

n.m.